

**Application No.:** 10/828,923  
**Filing Date:** April 21, 2004

## **SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW**

### Attendees, Date and Type of Interview

A telephone interview was conducted on March 3, 2009 and attended by Examiner Elizabeth MacNeill and Applicant's Counsel, Curtiss C. Dosier and John B. Swingle.

### Exhibits and/or Demonstrations

No exhibits or demonstrations were presented

### Identification of Claims Discussed

Claim 12 was discussed.

### Identification of Prior Art Discussed

U.S. Patent No. 5,425,723 to Wang and U.S. Patent No. 5,032,113 to Burns were discussed. U.S. Patent No. 7,438,711, which is co-owned with the present application, was also discussed.

### Proposed Amendments

No amendments were proposed.

### Principal Arguments and Other Matters

Applicant's Counsel argued that the cited prior art does not disclose or render obvious the pending claims. Applicant's Counsel argued that "wall insert 40" of Burns does not meet the claimed limitation of an "annular member disposed near the proximal end of said infusion section and configured to substantially prevent fluid introduced within said tube from entering said infusion section without first passing through said elongated member."

### Results of Interview

The Examiner agreed to withdraw the § 103 rejection of Claim 12 as obvious over Wang/Tremulis in view of Burns and to reconsider the patentability of Claim 12 in view of the prior art of record.